

STATEMENT UNDER ARTICLE 19 (1)

The present invention is a single one step process of extraction of peel and medulla portion of the tuberous roots of *Decalepis hamiltonii* Wight & Arn.,

XP 009030712 is a published paper on Chemical composition of the volatiles of **fleshy part of roots** of *Decalepis hamiltonii* (Wight & Arn) which discloses that its volatiles possess **antimicrobial and insecticidal** properties. The citation also discloses a process of **steam distillation** of the **only fleshy part** of the root **discarding** the **medulla and peel portion** of the tuberous roots.

The examiner has objected claims 1-7 which relate to the **antioxidant activity** of the extract of the instant invention. With regard to this the applicant respectfully submits that the present invention is beyond the scope of the cited art. Since **the cited art does not teach antioxidant activity of the extract**. There is not even a mere suggestion in the prior art, which may motivate the inventor to work on the extract to screen antioxidant activity. Furthermore, there was no clue in the cited art for the inventors to look for antioxidant property in the extract.

As regard to the examiners objection of claim 14, the applicant respectfully submits that, in the cited document XP 009030712 page 27, column 2, paragraph 2, and lines 1-3 teaches that only fleshy part is extracted discarding the central woody core (medulla) and peel of tuberous root. However in the present invention extract of medulla and peel of tuberous root comprises the composition. The applicant respectfully submits that the composition is restricted to extract of medulla and peel of tuberous root and claim 14 is amended accordingly.

The examiner has rejected claims 15-21 which relate to the single step extraction process of the instant application. With regard to this the applicant respectfully submits that, in the cited art page 29, 1st column, second paragraph, it was concluded that steam distillation was found to be a more suitable method for the isolation of volatile oils from the fleshy part of the roots when compared to extraction and other methods. The applicant wish to submit that the cited art does not motivate the inventor to select extraction method to get antioxidant rich extracts from the peel and medulla parts of the same root when extraction method was found to be not ideal in the cited art.

Further more the present process is a simple one step extraction method when compared with the cited process which involves steam distillation. The present process is less energy consuming since it does not require a steam distiller and to obtain a steam condensate and then for further extraction. The cited art also requires more of the solvent when compared with that required in the present process. It is an established fact in the art that that yield would always be better in solvent extraction when compared to steam distillation.

The Examiner is requested to consider the above arguments as persuasive against the citations and issue a positive written opinion in favor of the applicant.